

REMARKS

This application is amended in a manner to place it in condition for allowance at the time of the next Official Action.

Claims 1-7 are amended. Claims 9-21 are new. Support for the amended and new claims may be found generally throughout the specification, particularly at page 1, line 5 to page 2, line 26, page 7 lines 24-30, page 17 lines 19-24 and page 19 line 18 to page 20 line 23. Claim 8 is canceled. Claims 1-7 and 9-21 remain pending in the application.

The Official Action objected to claims 4-7 under 37 CFR 1.75 (c) as being improper multiple dependent claims. Specifically, claim 4 was objected because it did not refer back to a claim in an alternative form. Claim 4 is amended, and depends from claim 1 only. Claims 5-7 depend from claim 4. Accordingly, applicants believe the claims are in proper dependent claim form, and respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

The Official Action stated that the Chakrabartty (1995) article submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed October 5, 2003 was not considered because the Patent Office did not receive a copy of the entire article. Applicants will submit an entire subsequent to this response.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for lacking patentable utility because the claim did not recite any active